REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 14 and 19 are amended. New claims 49 and 50 are added. Claims 1-50 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As part of this response, claim 19 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis issue identified in the April 25 Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-20 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, 23, 27-33, 36, 39-42, and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,173,287 to Eberman et al. (hereinafter "Eberman"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, 23, 27-33, 36, 39-42, and 44-46 are not anticipated by Eberman.

Eberman is directed to a system in which an object database includes multiple objects, each of which represents some form of audio/video data (see, col. 15, lines 46-50). Annotations are generated for an object so as to provide information about the whole object or a part of the object (see, col. 15, lines 4-5). Annotations may be generated for an object by trusted automatic processes called annotation daemons, or by trusted human annotators (see, col. 15, lines 6-8). Each

annotation is listed in an annotation table (see, Fig. 10; col. 16, lines 65-67; col. 17, lines 14-16) with an object identification number of the object it is associated with (see, col. 17, lines 11-16). Each annotation in the annotation table is also listed with an annotation identification number (see, col. 17, lines 6-10), an annotation type (see, col. 17, lines 17-18), an annotation value (see, col. 17, lines 26-27), and an annotation start time and annotation end time (see, col. 17, lines 36-39).

With respect to claim 1, claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

> wherein the client supports a graphical user interface that presents a plurality of annotation identifiers corresponding to the multimedia content and that enables a user to request selected ones of the plurality of annotations, based on the plurality of annotation identifiers, **and to render the requested annotations**.

Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface that presents a plurality of annotation identifiers corresponding to multimedia content and that enables a user to request selected ones of the plurality of annotations, based on the plurality of annotation identifiers, and to render the requested annotations as claimed in claim 1.

Eberman discloses a browser client that allows the user to search, browse, and retrieve all or a portion of a digital representation (see, col. 8, lines 18-22). When the user enters a query, a message is sent from the browser to the index database server, which processes the message by searching the index database for annotations which match the query and obtaining the object identification number associated with each matching annotation (see, col. 8, lines 33-41). A results page is then built for presentation to the user, and includes an image or an icon corresponding to the URL of the digital representation from which each matching

annotation was generated (see, col. 8, lines 60-65). Once built, the results page is sent to the browser client so that the user can select one of the images or icons so as to browse and/or retrieve all or a portion of a corresponding digital representation (see, col. 9, lines 3-11).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman discloses rendering the digital representation and/or an image or icon corresponding to the URL of the digital representation, but does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface to render requested annotations. Applicant respectfully submits that neither rendering of the digital representation nor rendering of an image or icon corresponding to the URL of the digital representation discloses or suggests rendering an annotation itself. As discussed above, Eberman discloses using annotations as a basis for searching for objects, not rendering the requested annotations as claimed in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface for adding annotations as claimed in claim 3. Eberman includes a reference to human annotators generating annotations (see, col. 15, lines 4-11). However, Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in Eberman is there any discussion of <u>how</u> a human annotator generates annotations. Applicant notes that Eberman discloses that annotations are listed in an annotation table that maintains an annotation ID, object ID, annotation type, annotation value, annotation start time, and annotation end time (see, Fig. 10, and col. 16, lines 65-67). However, Applicant respectfully submits

that there is no discussion in Eberman of how such a table is populated with data by a human annotator.

Given the absence of such discussions in Eberman, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of a graphical user interface for adding annotations to an annotation database from a network client including both an annotation content field and an annotation type selector, much less a disclosure or suggestion of the presentation of the annotation content field being changed based on the selected annotation type as claimed in claim 3.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest an annotation set selector via which a user can identify one or more of a plurality of annotation sets to be searched as claimed in claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of annotation sets, much less a disclosure or suggestion of a user being able to identify one or more of a plurality of annotation sets to be searched as claimed in claim 12. The portions of Eberman that were cited as teaching an annotation set selector (col. 8, lines 18-32 – see, April 25 Office Action at p. 4) disclose a browser client that allows a user to search, browse, and retrieve all or a portion of a digital representation. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the mere disclosure of allowing a user to search, browse, and retrieve all or a portion of a digital representation does not disclose annotation sets or an annotation set selector as claimed in claim 12.

Eberman further discloses an HTML query page (see, Fig. 11 and col. 20, line 66 – col. 21, line 9). This query page includes a search field, however there is no discussion of any annotation set selector being included on this query page. Applicant respectfully submits that the mere disclosure of a search field on a query page does not disclose or suggest annotation sets or an annotation set selector as claimed in claim 12.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to amended claim 14, amended claim 14 depends from claim 12 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface to search for annotations corresponding to media content comprising a search criteria portion that includes an annotation creation date entry field as claimed in amended claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion in Eberman of annotation creation dates, much less of an annotation creation date entry field on the query page of Eberman. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 3, there is no discussion in Eberman of how a human annotator generates annotations or how the annotation table is populated with data by a human annotator. Given the absence of such discussions, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion of a graphical user interface including an annotation content portion, an annotation

identifier portion, and an input button as claimed in claim 23. Applicant respectfully submits that the mere disclosure of a human annotator does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface including an annotation content portion, an annotation identifier portion, and an input button as claimed in claim 23. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 28, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of forwarding information for a new annotation to an annotation server, the information including data associated with the user interface as claimed in claim 28. As discussed above with respect to claim 3, there is no discussion in Eberman of how a human annotator generates annotations or how the annotation table is populated with data by a human annotator. Given the absence of such discussions in Eberman, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of forwarding information for a new annotation to an annotation server, the information including data associated with the user interface as claimed in claim 28. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion of such a user interface in Eberman, much less a discussion of forwarding information including data associated with the user interface to an annotation server as claimed in claim 28. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 29, claim 29 depends from claim 28 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 28. Furthermore, Applicant

respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest that the data associated with the user interface comprises an annotation set identifier as claimed in claim 29. Analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion of annotation sets in Eberman, much less of an annotation set identifier as claimed in claim 29.

In the April 25 Office Action, it was asserted that the "object identification number" of Eberman teaches the annotation set identifier as claimed in claim 29 (see, April 25 Office Action at p. 4). Applicant respectfully submits that the object identification number of Eberman does not disclose or suggest the annotation set identifier as claimed in claim 29. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of an object identification number being associated with a user interface. Although an object has an identification number in Eberman, there is nothing about this identification number that associates it with a user interface. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the object identification number of Eberman does not disclose or suggest an annotation set identifier as claimed in claim 29, since the object identification number of Eberman is not associated with the user interface as the annotation set identifier is in claim 29.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 32, claim 32 recites, in part:

> presenting a user interface at a client computer, the user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content;
> receiving a user request to add the new annotation;

> analyzing at least a portion of the media content to identify a likely temporal location of the media content to associate the new annotation with; and
> presenting the likely temporal location to the user via the user interface.

Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest such presenting, receiving, analyzing, and presenting as claimed in claim 32. As discussed above with respect to claim 3, there is no discussion in Eberman of how a human annotator generates annotations or how the annotation table is populated with data by a human annotator. Given the absence of such discussions in Eberman, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of presenting a user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content and presenting a likely temporal location of the media content to associate the new annotation with to the user via the user interface as claimed in claim 32.

Applicant notes that Eberman does disclose that a previously generated annotation may be reviewed and updated by a human annotator (see, col. 15, lines 8-11). However, as indicated in Eberman, this review and update is of a previously generated annotation, not a new annotation. Applicant respectfully submits that the mere disclosure of reviewing and updating a previously generated annotation does not disclose or suggest presenting a user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content and presenting to the user via the user interface a likely temporal location of the media content to associate the new annotation with as claimed in claim 32.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 42, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 32, Eberman does not disclose or suggest presenting a graphical user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content, and presenting to the user a plurality of likely temporal locations of the media content to associate the new annotation with as claimed in claim 42.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of presenting, to the user, a plurality of likely temporal locations of the media content to associate the new annotation with as claimed in claim 42. Analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 3, there is no discussion in Eberman of how a human annotator generates annotations or how the annotation table is populated with data by a human annotator. Given the absence of such discussions in Eberman, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of presenting to the user a plurality of likely temporal locations of the media content to associate the new annotation with and receiving a user selection of one of the plurality of likely temporal locations as claimed in claim 42.

Applicant respectfully submits that the portions of Eberman that are cited as teaching presenting a plurality of likely temporal locations of the media content to associate the new annotation with (figs. 12-13; col. 15, lines 4-11 – see, April 25 Office Action at p. 5) do not disclose or suggest presenting to the user a plurality of likely temporal locations of the media content to associate the new annotation with as claimed in claim 42. The cited portions of Eberman are directed to submitting queries and receiving results (see, for example, col. 22, line

23-25, and col. 23, lines 5-9). Applicant respectfully submits that the query results discussed in Eberman do not disclose or suggest presenting to the user a plurality of likely temporal locations of the media content to associate a new annotation with, the graphical user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content, as claimed in claim 42.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 42 is allowable over Eberman.

Given that claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 3, claim 27 depends from claim 23, claims 30 and 31 depend from claim 28, claims 33, 36, and 39-41 depend from claim 32, and claims 44-46 depend from claim 42, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 11, 27, 30, 31, 33, 36, 39-41, and 44-46 are likewise allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-6, 8, 13, 15-22, 24, 26, 34-35, 37-38, and 47-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eberman. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-6, 8, 13, 15-22, 24, 26, 34-35, 37-38, and 47-48 are not obvious over Eberman.

With respect to claims 4-6 and 8, claims 4-6 and 8 depend from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Eberman does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface that presents a plurality of annotation identifiers corresponding to multimedia content and that enables a user to request selected ones of the plurality of annotations, based on the

plurality of annotation identifiers, and to render the requested annotations as claimed in claim 1. Given their dependence on claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-6 and 8 are allowable over Eberman for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to claim 13, claim 13 depends from claim 12 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest a target check box, whereupon selection of the target check box causes the network client to add, as an additional search criteria, a media content identifier as claimed in claim 13. From the cited portions of Eberman (fig. 11; col. 9, lines 12-31; and col. 21, lines 8-9 – see, April 25 Office Action at p. 6), it appears that the "advanced search" option 178 in fig. 11 of Eberman is being cited as suggesting the target check box of claim 13. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the mere disclosure of an "advanced search" option in Eberman does not disclose or suggest a media content identifier as an additional search criteria as claimed in claim 13. With respect to the extended URLs specifying starting and ending times discussed at col. 9, lines 12-31, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion of these URLs being a media content identifier as an additional search criteria as claimed in claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that the mere disclosure of extended URLs specifying starting and ending times and an "advanced search" option does not disclose or suggest a target check box, whereupon selection of the target check box causes the network client to add, as an additional search criteria, a media content identifier as claimed in claim 13.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 15, claim 15 depends from claim 12 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12.

With respect to claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Eberman discloses rendering the digital representation and/or an image or icon corresponding to the URL of the digital representation, but does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface for viewing annotations corresponding to media content. Applicant notes that Eberman discloses that annotations are listed in an annotation table that maintains an annotation ID, object ID, annotation type, annotation value, annotation start time, and annotation end time (see, Fig. 10, and col. 16, lines 65-67). However, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion in Eberman of how such a table is populated with data by a human annotator or of how a human annotator generates annotations. Given the absence of such discussions in Eberman, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of a graphical user interface comprising an annotation identifier list and an actuation mechanism as claimed in claim 16.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 18, claim 18 depends from claim 16 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is allowable over Eberman for at least the

reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest that the identifier for an annotation includes one or more of an indication of an author of the annotation, an indication of an annotation set that the annotation belongs to, an indication of a date the annotation was created, and a summary of the annotation as claimed in claim 18. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Eberman discloses rendering the digital representation and/or an image or icon corresponding to the URL of the digital representation, but does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface for viewing annotations as claimed in claim 16. The information displayed in Fig. 12 of Eberman is for the object that is associated with each matching annotation value (see, col. 22, lines 31-33), not information associated with the annotation. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Eberman of a graphical user interface comprising an annotation identifier list that includes one or more of the identifier for an annotation including an author of the annotation, an indication of an annotation set that the annotation belongs to, an indication of a date the annotation was created, and a summary of the annotation as claimed in claim 18.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claims 17 and 19-22, claims 17 and 19-22 depend from claim 16 and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 19-22 are allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16.

With respect to claims 24 and 26, claims 24 and 26 depend from claim 23 and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 24 and 26 are allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 23.

With respect to claims 34, 35, 37, and 38, claims 34, 35, 37, and 38 depend from claim 32 and Applicant respectfully submits that claims 34, 35, 37, and 38 are allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 32.

With respect to claim 47, claim 47 recites, in part:

> presenting a graphical user interface at a client computer, the graphical user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content;
> receiving a user request to add the new annotation;
> identifying a user request time that is a time, with reference to the presentation time of the media content, that the user request is received; and
> selecting, based on the user request time, a presentation time of the media content to associate the new annotation with, wherein the presentation time is a different time than the user request time.

Applicant respectfully submits that Eberman does not disclose or suggest the presenting, receiving, identifying, and selecting as claimed in claim 47.

Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 3, there is no discussion in Eberman of how a human annotator generates annotations or how the annotation table is populated with data by a human annotator. Given the absence of such discussions, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion of presenting a graphical user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content, and selecting a presentation time of the media content to associate the new annotation with based on the identified user request time as claimed in claim 47.

The cited portions of Eberman (col. 8 line 18-col. 9, line 31 – see April 25 Office Action at p. 10), as well as the corresponding discussion in the April 25 Office Action (see, p. 10), refer to searching, browsing, and retrieving all or a portion of a digital representation. Although the annotations in Eberman are used as a basis for searching for objects, there is no discussion of using this searching, browsing, or retrieving to add new annotations. The cited portions of Eberman are directed to searching, browsing, and retrieving digital representations, not a graphical user interface enabling a user to add a new annotation corresponding to media content as claimed in claim 47.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 is allowable over Eberman.

With respect to claim 48, claim 48 depends from claim 47 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 48 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 47.

Claims 2 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eberman in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,649,499 to Sutton et al. (hereinafter "Sutton"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 25 are not obvious over Eberman in view of Sutton.

Sutton is directed to utilizing a touchscreen to emulate three-dimensional objects on a two-dimensional computer screen (see, col. 1, lines 30-34). A financial calculator program is described that emulates a handheld calculator (see, col. 3, lines 20-23). The financial calculator program outputs a series of programmable softkeys that allow the operator to issue instruction merely by touching the softkeys (see, col. 3, lines 44-46).

With respect to claim 2, claim 2 depends from claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Sutton is not cited as curing, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sutton does not cure, the deficiencies of Eberman discussed above with respect to claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Eberman in view of Sutton, and thus claim 2 is allowable over Eberman in view of Sutton at least because of its dependency on claim 1.

With respect to claim 25, claim 25 depends from claim 23 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 23. Sutton is not cited as curing, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sutton does not cure, the deficiencies of Eberman discussed above with respect to claim 23. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is allowable over Eberman in view of Sutton, and thus claim 25 is allowable over Eberman in view of Sutton at least because of its dependency on claim 23.

Claims 7 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eberman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,775 to King et al. (hereinafter "King"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 43 are not obvious over Eberman in view of King.

King is directed to an efficient, accurate method and apparatus for annotating full motion digital video, or other indexed data files (see, col. 2, lines 3-5). In King, an annotation tool includes playback buttons, including a button used to jump to the previous annotation in the annotation list for a given work, and a

button used to jump to the next annotation in an annotated work (see, col. 5, lines 53-56).

With respect to claim 7, claim 7 depends from claim 3 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 3. King is not cited as curing, and Applicant respectfully submits that King does not cure, the deficiencies of Eberman discussed above with respect to claim 3. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is allowable over Eberman in view of King, and thus claim 7 is allowable over Eberman in view of King at least because of its dependency on claim 3.

With respect to claim 43, claim 43 depends from claim 42 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42. King is not cited as curing, and Applicant respectfully submits that King does not cure, the deficiencies of Eberman discussed above with respect to claim 42. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 42 is allowable over Eberman in view of King, and thus claim 43 is allowable over Eberman in view of King at least because of its dependency on claim 42.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eberman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313 to Hou et al. (hereinafter "Hou"). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is not obvious over Eberman in view of Hou.

Hou discloses a multimedia-based reporting system that allows drawing, text, and audio recording annotations to be added to the report (see, col. 2, lines

40-61, and col. 6, lines 52-66). The reporting system of Hou includes an annotation input interpreter that provides an interface between the user annotation input and three types of annotation handlers that can add annotations to a "canvas" of the report: a static annotation handler, a dynamic annotation handler, and an annotation on annotation handler (see, Fig. 9, and col. 6, lines 25-29).

With respect to claim 9, claim 9 depends from claim 3 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over Eberman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 3. Hou is not cited as curing, and Applicant respectfully submits that Hou does not cure, the deficiencies of Eberman discussed above with respect to claim 3. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is allowable over Eberman in view of Hou, and thus claim 9 is allowable over Eberman in view of Hou at least because of its dependency on claim 3.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 49 and 50 are added to the subject application.

With respect to claim 49, claim 49 depends from claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 49 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a system as recited in claim 1, wherein each annotation identifier of the plurality of annotation identifiers comprises an annotation subject line of an annotation corresponding to the multimedia content as claimed in claim 49. For at least these

reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 49 is allowable over the cited references.

With respect to claim 50, claim 50 depends from claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 50 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 23. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface as recited in claim 23, wherein the annotation identifier portion identifies each of the plurality of annotations by an annotation subject line as claimed in claim 50. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 50 is allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Claims 1-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/25/02

By:

Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256

Version of Claims with Markings to Show Changes Made

14. (Amended) A graphical user interface as recited in claim 12, wherein the search criteria portion includes [one or more of:] an annotation creation date entry field[, a keyword entry field, and a temporal range entry field].

19. (Amended) A graphical user interface as recited in claim 16, further comprising a mechanism to identify a particular identifier that corresponds to an annotation of the plurality of annotations with a temporal range having a beginning time closest to [the] a current presentation time of the media content.